

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Final Office Action mailed June 30, 2009 has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive to that Office Action. Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 12-17, 19, 20, 22-31, 34, 36-38, 40-50, and 52-54 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26-29, 31, 36-37, 40, 43-44, 46, 49-50, and 53-54 have been amended without adding new matter and claims 6-7, 10-11, 18, 21, 32-33, 35, 39, and 51 have been cancelled.

#### **Interview Summary**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for his time during the interview conducted on August 12, 2009. During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed the differences between "time-slicing" as used in the claim language and the TDMA system discussed by Chennakeshu. It was agreed that DVB is not discussed in Chennakeshu and that incorporation of such language into the claims would further describe Applicants claimed features and be distinguishable over Chennakeshu.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants thank the Examiner for stating that claim 26 includes allowable subject matter.

#### **Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-5, 8-9, 12-17, 19-21, 23-25, 27-30, 52 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,822,310), hereinafter referred to as Chennakeshu, in view of Kasper (U.S. Application No. 2002/0133647), hereinafter referred to as Kasper.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, among other things:

powering-up a digital video broadcast receiver in the mobile terminal in synchronicity with the transmission of said digital video broadcast transmission burst such that the

mobile terminal is powered-up when said digital video broadcast transmission burst is being received

Neither Chennakehsu nor Kasper, alone or in combination, teach or suggest at least this element of independent claim 1. The Office Action on page 3 alleges that Chennakeshu taught the previous version of claim 1. In making this assertion, the Office Action cites column 3, lines 30-34 of Chennakeshu. Chennakeshu teaches a traditional time domain multiple access (TDMA) system; it does not teach or suggest a system in which time-slicing signals are transmitted. To make this point clearer, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include the claim term “digital video broadcast transmission burst.” DVB and DVB-H are known to be implementations of time-slicing and one of ordinary skill in the art would know that these implementations would be different from the TDMA system discussed by Chennakeshu.

Hence, Applicants submit that independent claim 1 distinguishes over the references of record and is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-5, 8-9, 12-17, and 52 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and further in view of the various features recited therein. Independent claim 19 has similar features to those of claim 1 discussed above. Hence, independent claim 19 is in condition for allowance for similar reasons given in support of claim 1. Dependent claims 20, 23-25, and 27-30 depend on independent claim 19 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 19, and further in view of the various features recited therein. Independent claim 54 has similar features to those of claim 1 discussed above. Hence, independent claim 54 is in condition for allowance for similar reasons given in support of claim 1.

Claims 31, 36-38, 40, 46 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu in view of Karabinis (U.S. Application No. 2003/0054760), hereinafter referred to as Karabinis. Independent claim 31 has similar features to those of claim 1 discussed above. Hence, independent claim 31 is in condition for allowance for similar reasons given in support of claim 1. Dependent claims 36-38 and 40 depend on claim 31 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 31, and further in view of the various

features recited therein. Independent claim 46 has similar features to those of claim 1 discussed above. Hence, independent claim 46 is in condition for allowance for similar reasons given in support of claim 1. Dependent claim 53 depends on independent claim 46 and is distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 46, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claims 41-42, 47 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu in view of Karabinis further in view of Kasper. Dependent claims 41 and 42 depend on independent claim 31 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 31, and further in view of the various features recited therein. Dependent claims 47 and 50 depend on independent claim 46 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 46, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Claims 43-45 and 48-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chennakeshu in view of Karabinis in view of Hanko et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,438,141), hereinafter referred to as Hanko. Dependent claims 43-45 depend on independent claim 31 and are distinguishable for at least the same reasons as claim 31, and further in view of the various features recited therein.

Appln. No.: 10/087,437  
Amendment dated: September 30, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of June 30, 2009

It is believed that no fee is required for this submission. If any fees are required or if an overpayment is made, the Commissioner is authorized to debit or credit our Deposit Account No. 19-0733, accordingly.

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 30, 2009

By: William J. Allen/  
William J. Allen  
Registration No. 51,393  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
10 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001